

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,  
vs.

EDUARDO GOMEZ,

Defendant.

**4:24CR3010**

**ORDER**

A telephone status conference was held today on Defendant Eduardo Gomez's unopposed motion to continue the pretrial motion deadline (Filing No. 97). After discussion during such conference, the motion is denied, namely, because Defendant Gomez does not anticipate filing a pretrial motion. During the status conference, Defendant moved to continue the telephone conference because Defendant needs additional time to consider and decide whether to enter a guilty plea or go to trial. Based upon the showing set forth in the telephone conference, the Court finds good cause that this motion should be granted. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED:

- 1) Defendant's motion to continue, (Filing No. 97), is denied.
- 2) Defendant's motion to continue the telephone conference is granted. A telephonic conference with counsel will be held before the undersigned magistrate judge at 9:15 a.m. on July 15, 2024 to discuss setting any change of plea hearing, or the date of the jury trial and deadlines for disclosing experts as required under Rule 16. Counsel for all parties shall use the conferencing instructions provided by the court to participate in the call.
- 3) The court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the motion to continue outweigh the interests of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial, and the additional time arising as a result of the granting of the motion, the time between today's date and July 15, 2024 shall be deemed excludable time in any computation of time under the requirements of the Speedy Trial Act, because although counsel have been duly diligent, additional time is needed to adequately prepare this case for trial and failing to grant additional time might result in a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1) & (h)(7). Failing to timely object to this order as provided under this court's local rules will be deemed a waiver of any right to later claim the time should not have been excluded under the Speedy Trial Act.

Dated this 11<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2024.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Jacqueline M. DeLuca  
United States Magistrate Judge